

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

WILLIAM HEATHCOTE, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly situated
(ALMA SUE CROFT),

Plaintiff,

v.

SPINX GAMES LIMITED, GRANDE
GAMES LIMITED, and BEIJING BOLE
TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-01310-RSM

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Protective Order. Dkt. #56.

The Court finds that the proposed Protective Order does not conform to the requirement that its "protection from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles" as stated by Local Rule 26(c)(2). Under the section entitled Confidential Material, the Court's model protective order instructs: "[t]he parties must include a list of specific documents such as 'company's customer list' or 'plaintiff's medical records;' do not list broad categories of documents such as 'sensitive business material.'" The parties have not followed these instructions and instead drafted an order stating in part that confidential material "shall include...sensitive communications and information relating to products and services, *including*,

1 *but not limited to*, advertising data, which in the hands of competitors would be valuable;” and
2 “other non-public business information that is treated confidentially by the producing party in
3 the ordinary course of business, the disclosure of which may cause the producing party to be
4 commercially disadvantaged or prejudiced.” Dkt. #56 at 1–2 (emphasis added).

5 Although some proper categories of documents are referenced, the Court finds that the
6 parties have impermissibly left the door open to labeling a wide variety of documents as
7 confidential, including categories that can be summed up as “sensitive business material.” The
8 parties submit no argument to justify this departure from the model protective order’s guidelines.
9 Given all of the above, the Motion will be denied.
10

11 Having reviewed the briefing, along with the remainder of the record, the Court hereby
12 finds and ORDERS that the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order, Dkt. #56, is DENIED.

13 DATED this 16th day of March, 2022.
14
15

16 

17 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
18 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27